



*Maryland Department of Planning*

*Martin O'Malley*  
Governor  
*Anthony G. Brown*  
Lt. Governor

*Richard Eberhart Hall*  
Secretary  
*Matthew J. Power*  
Deputy Secretary

Mr. David L. Kibler  
Town Manager  
P.O. Box 340  
Greensboro, MD 21639

August 13, 2009

Dear Mr. Kibler:

The Maryland Department of Planning has completed the coordinated review of the Water Resources Element of the Town of Greensboro Comprehensive Plan, 2008.

The Plan was sent to the Maryland Departments of Transportation, Environment, Natural Resources, Business and Economic Development, Housing and Community Development, and Agriculture. Comments received after the date of this letter will be forwarded to you upon receipt.

Our planning staff has also reviewed the proposed update for consistency with the Planning Act of 1992, the Smart Growth Areas Act of 1997, HB1141 and other State growth management principles and policies. Our review comments are attached for your consideration.

Please contact Shawn Kiernan at (410) 767-4573 or [skiernan@mdp.state.md.us](mailto:skiernan@mdp.state.md.us) if you have any questions about these comments or if we can be of any further assistance.

The Maryland Department of Planning looks forward to our continued planning coordination with the Town of Greensboro.

Sincerely,

Peter Conrad  
Director, Local Planning

cc: Bruce Halloway, Town Planner  
Anthony Redman, URS  
Shawn Kiernan, MDP



**Review Comments from the Maryland Department of Planning  
Town of Greensboro  
Draft Water Resources Element  
Prepared August 13, 2009**

Overview

The Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) reviewed the draft Water Resources Element (WRE) dated June 9, 2009 of the Town of Greensboro Comprehensive Plan. The draft WRE was submitted for 60-day review in accordance with Article 66B of the Code of Maryland Regulations and was received by MDP on June 11, 2009. The 60-day review period ended on August 10, 2009. The Town has not scheduled a public hearing on the WRE in accordance with §3.07(b)(1) of Article 66B.

The draft WRE as submitted is incomplete; however by making the following additions or addressing the following comments, the WRE will conform to the requirements of HB 1141. Those comments in bold must be adequately addressed for full compliance with State Law and the provisions to re-zone accordingly.

- Identify suitable receiving waters and land areas to meet the stormwater management and wastewater treatment and disposal needs of existing and future development proposed in the land use element of the plan, considering available data provided by the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) (Section 1.03(iii), Article 66B);
- The WRE should, for each watershed, calculate the total forecasted nutrient load, which includes nutrient loads from current and future wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) discharge, septic tanks, and stormwater runoff (MDP Models and Guidelines #26, page 13);
- Does the WRE estimate the future demand for water by reviewing population projections and associated commercial, industrial, and agricultural water demand (MDP Models and Guidelines #26, page 27);
- Does the WRE show the estimate of the approximate number or range of additional households and associated commercial, industrial, and agricultural wastewater capacity potential (MDP Models and Guidelines #26, page 33); and
- Does the WRE identify planning strategies to protect current and future water sources from pollution (MDP Models and Guidelines #26, page 27).

### General Comments on the Municipal Growth Element

House Bill (HB) 1141 requires the inclusion of the WRE and a Municipal Growth Element (MGE) which complement each other. The Town's draft Comprehensive Plan dated December 1, 2008 does not include a specific section entitled "Municipal Growth Element"; however chapter 3 entitled "Growth Considerations" contains most of the required components of a Municipal Growth Element as directed by statute. While not a direct function of this review, the close relationship between the MGE and WRE predicates the need to review both in concert.

- MDP would recommend that chapter 3 entitled "Growth Considerations" section be renamed as the "Municipal Growth Element" for reader clarity.
- MDP understands that the Town's Comprehensive Plan anticipates reaching buildout within the Town's existing municipal corporate boundary by approximately 2015 and that no annexations are planned during this period. This timeframe also coincides with the required 6 year review of adopted Comprehensive Plans established in §1.03(c)(2) and §3.04(b)(2) of Article 66B. MDP would encourage the Town of Greensboro to use the Comprehensive Plan as a tool for planning beyond a six-year horizon and include discussion and prioritization of future annexations based on population projections. MDP would also remind the Town that future annexations must be deemed consistent with the locally adopted Comprehensive Plan.
- Chapter 3 of the draft Comprehensive Plan does not identify or prioritize future annexations that may be necessary under Scenarios 2-4. If annexation is proposed by the Town in the future, these areas should be identified and prioritized in the final Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the final Comprehensive Plan must discuss the anticipated impacts on capacity and infrastructure associated with any new annexation. If no annexation is proposed, the final Comprehensive Plan should explicitly indicate such intent.
- The draft Comprehensive Plan indicates that no additional library space would be necessary but does not appear to indicate how much library space is currently available to Town residents.
- The draft Comprehensive Plan does not include specific discussion of stormwater management systems sufficient to ensure water quality both inside and outside any proposed municipal growth area. Please refer to MDP Models and Guidelines #25, pages 16-17 for more information and include this discussion in the final Comprehensive Plan.

### General Comments on the Draft Water Resources Element

- Please include maps of the existing Town water and sewer service areas.

- The final WRE recommended for Town approval should indicate that the land use plan from the Town's draft Comprehensive Plan dated December 1, 2008 was used in the analysis of this section.
- The final WRE should establish a preferred growth scenario (e.g., Scenario 1) and use it to consistently evaluate potential water and sewer demand as well as for land use change within the planning period. The preferred growth scenario should best reflect what is likely or desired for the Town's future. Currently the draft WRE evaluates Scenario 1 for future wastewater demand (page 9) and for future nonpoint source pollution (pages 13-14) but evaluates Scenario 2 (page 28 of the draft Comprehensive Plan) for future water demand (page 7).
- The draft WRE does not currently indicate or prioritize any proposed annexation areas. If annexation areas are proposed by the Town in the future, the final WRE should evaluate the water and sewer demand and land use change impacts expected at build-out of those areas.

#### Comments on the Water Demand Analysis

- The final WRE should indicate whether there are any private wells in the town. If wells exist, please identify any plans to connect failing wells to the public water system and the capacity needed to serve them. The WRE could discuss whether any private wells are susceptible to pollution and might be included in future source water protection plans.
- There appears to be an error in the units of measurement for the design capacities listed for the three wells (page 6). For example, the Academy Street well is indicated to have a capacity of 300,000 gallons per minute (gpm). This metric appears to be incorrect. Please clarify whether this well has a design capacity of 300,000 gallons per day (gpd) or 300 gpm. Please also review and correct, if necessary, this information for the other two wells.
- Please clarify how the well capacity figure of 300 gpm listed in the second to last paragraph on page 6 was derived. This figure is not listed as the capacity of any of the three wells described above on the same page.
- **Table 3 (page 7) calculates projected water demand through 2030 based on population forecasts. The table does not appear to include non-residential water demand figures. Both current and projected non-residential water demand figures must be included in this table in order to establish a complete view of water demand.**
- The caption for Table 3 indicates that Chapter 3 of the draft Comprehensive Plan is referred to as the "Municipal Growth Element"; however the draft Comprehensive Plan dated December 2008 refers to chapter 3 as "Growth Considerations". Please ensure that the labeling of the caption is consistent with the chapter title for reader clarity.

- Please clarify that the growth scenario for projected water demand in Table 3 reflects Scenario 2 (1% annual growth) according to the “Growth Considerations” of the Town’s draft Comprehensive Plan. In addition, please reiterate in the final WRE that this growth rate is only possible if water and sewer infrastructure and services are upgraded and expanded. Please revise the text and table if this information does not reflect the Town’s preferred Growth Scenario.
- The third paragraph on page 7 states, “Water demand is based on existing dwellings as well as potential units, which may be built through infill development of vacant and underutilized lots within the current municipal boundary and/or in Town designated municipal growth areas.” Table 3 indicates demand based on projected growth that continues past build-out (beyond 2015). If the Town is considering growth beyond current municipal boundaries, as supported by Table 3, those areas should be clearly delineated. Please revise the text and table if this information does not reflect the Town’s preferred Growth Scenario.

#### Comments on the Proposed Methods for Protecting Source Water

- **The draft WRE cites a 2003 Source Water Assessments study by MDE which found that the water quality is “generally good” in the Piney Point Aquifer; however, the draft WRE lacks discussion of methods for protecting its source water. Please include this discussion in the final WRE.**

#### Comments on the Sewer Demand Analysis

- The draft WRE does not state whether any residences or businesses in the Town are serviced by septic systems. Please add this information to the final WRE. If septic systems do exist, please note whether there are any plans to connect any failing systems to the public system and the capacity that would be necessary to serve them.
- The projected wastewater demand is calculated through build-out within the Town’s current boundaries and not through 2030 (page 9). It would be helpful to add a table similar to the projected water demand table (Table 7) that projects sewer demand through 2030 for 5-year increments of time using the same growth scenario (Scenario 2). Please revise the text and table if this is not the Town’s preferred Growth Scenario.
- **It is unclear whether the figures in Table 4 (page 9) reflect both residential and non-residential sewer demand. Please clarify whether both demand figures are included. The final WRE should include figures for both residential and non-residential demand.**

## Comments on Identifying Suitable Receiving Waters

- The draft WRE states, “This data also indicates that total nitrogen loads for the year resulted in discharges of 8,522 lbs of nitrogen, well below the 9,876 lbs per year permitted level” (page 11). Please clarify whether this cap is part of the WWTP discharge permit or whether this is the plant’s projected Tributary Strategy Point Source Cap in the final WRE. If this is in fact the projected Tributary Strategy Point Source Cap, the number is slightly incorrect. Instead of 9,876 lbs per year, the correct figure would be 9,867 lbs per year.
- The final WRE should note that if the WWTP were to expand its design capacity, its cap would be reduced to 6,100 lbs per year of nitrogen and 457 lbs per year of phosphorous.
- The draft WRE indicates that more recent point source discharge data is less than the 2007 data from Table 6, in particular citing the nitrogen discharge figure (page 11). The Town should consider including the phosphorous discharge figure from this more recent source as well. Also, if possible, please explain why and how the recent data differs from the information reported in the draft WRE.
- The final WRE should include a map showing the location of the Town’s WWTP outfalls and the location and course of the unnamed tributary that receives effluent from the facility.
- **The final WRE should include a table with both current and future combined point source and non-point source loading amounts.**
- The draft WRE does not indicate whether any Tier II waterbodies are or would be impacted within the Town. If identified, the final WRE should also indicate the Town’s plan for minimizing those impacts.
- **Table 6 (page 10) includes 2007 point source pollution loading data but does not include projected point source pollution loading data to 2030. Table 6 in the final WRE should include this projected data.**
- **The Town should be commended for including a discussion of the suitability of receiving waters; however without a TMDL or other measure of assimilative capacity of a receiving waterbody currently in place, the Town cannot know for certain whether future impacts will exceed that assimilative capacity. Therefore, the Town cannot certify whether the waterbody is suitable for future combined wastewater and stormwater impacts associated with implementation of the Town’s proposed land use plan. If this information is not available, the final Comprehensive Plan should be revised to acknowledge that fact and that the suitability of the receiving waters cannot be determined at this time.**

**The following statements on page 14 should be revised to acknowledge this fact: “Therefore, it would appear that Greensboro’s growth will represent a small proportion of total TMDL’s likely to be allocated for non-point sources, and can be readily accommodated in watershed-wide context”.**

#### Other Water Resource Planning Comments

- The first paragraph on page 13 suggests that there are 21 existing vacant parcels in the town. Table 4, however, states that there are 72 existing vacant parcel. Please clarify which figure is correct in the final WRE.
- MDP commends the Town on its recommendation to consider amending the local Stormwater Management Regulations to incorporate the Environmental Site Design (ESD) principles of the State Stormwater Management Act of 2007 into the Town’s future development and site planning standards. It would be helpful to briefly discuss the Town’s plans for implementing the new regulations in the final WRE. Please keep the Department informed regarding your progress on these amendments.

#### Local Adoption Comments

- The Town has indicated that a public hearing was held regarding to solicit comments on the draft Comprehensive Plan dated December 1, 2008. This version of the plan did not contain the draft Water Resources Element. Due process in accordance with procedures codified in §3.07 of Article 66B for recommending adoption, amendment or approval of plan or elements of a plan would include a public hearing on the WRE following the close of the 60-day review period. In order to meet the intent and due process of Article 66B, MDP strongly encourages the Town Planning Commission to hold a public hearing on the proposed WRE prior to recommending adoption of the plan.
- MDP reminds the Town that the Town Planning Commission is required to review and, if necessary, revise or amend the Town’s adopted Comprehensive Plan at least once every 6 years in accordance with §3.04(b)(2) of Article 66B.